

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

In re A.M., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E048628

(Super.Ct.No. J227414\*)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Shep Zebberman,  
Temporary Judge,<sup>†</sup> and Harold T. Wilson, Jr., Judge. Affirmed.

---

\* On transfer from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

<sup>†</sup> Pursuant to article VI, section 21, of the California Constitution. Judge Zebberman presided over the contested jurisdiction hearing and sustained the petition in Los Angeles County. The court then ordered the matter transferred to San Bernardino County for disposition.

Christy Chandler, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Minor A.M. appeals the juvenile court's finding she committed second degree robbery. (Pen. Code, § 211.) We will affirm.

### FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

At the contested jurisdictional hearing, the victim testified he was driving his car in Los Angeles on May 1, 2009, between 10:30 and 11:30 p.m. While stopped at an intersection with his car windows rolled down, minor approached the driver's side of the car, put something towards the left side of his neck, and demanded money. He testified, "I don't know what it was, if it was a knife or a fork, I don't know." Afraid she would hurt him, the victim took \$60 out of his pocket and gave it to the minor. She "ran off" after he gave her the money. Using his cell phone, he called police to report the crime and gave them a description of the minor. When he was on his way home, he saw minor using a public telephone, so he called police again. He watched her until police arrived. Police detained minor and the victim was able to identify her.

The police officer who detained minor asked her whether she had any weapons in the bag she was carrying. She said she did not, but she did say she had a fork inside the bag. She gave the officer permission to search the bag, and he found a chrome fork with a white plastic handle. Minor agreed to speak to the officer after being advised of her rights. She said the victim approached her, asked for sex, and handed her \$60. After telling the victim she was only 17 and was not a prostitute, she said she became upset,

took the money, and fled. Minor also told the officer she had \$220 on her person, and \$60 of that was taken from the victim. During a search by a female officer, the victim took \$220 from her genitalia and handed it to the officer.

Minor testified in her own defense and claimed the victim gestured and called her over to his car. She got in the car. The victim then handed her \$60 for sex, drove the car around the corner, and parked. She warned him she was only 17 years old, but he “didn’t care.” When the victim started acting “really funny,” she thought she was at risk and got out of the car. She walked away with the victim’s money. During her testimony, she admitted she had previously been arrested for prostitution.

Based on the testimony, the juvenile court concluded minor committed a robbery in the second degree. In reaching its decision, the court said, “I am going to sustain the petition. I also do think that what happened was somewhere a cross between the two versions. I think portions of the versions of both the victim and minor were very untruthful. I think some parts were truthful. I think whichever version you take it’s a theft. The question is, is it a robbery. [¶] I do note the victim testified that he felt a chrome object on his neck and minor had a chrome object consistent with that in her back pack when she was stopped . . . . [¶] I don’t think there’s any dispute that she took the money. I guess the question that I have considers how and I believe that there was a chrome object involved. [¶] So count 1 is sustained. It is a felony, second degree.”

After the jurisdictional hearing, the matter was transferred to the San Bernardino County Superior Court for disposition, because San Bernardino was the minor’s county of residence. At a dispositional hearing held June 15, 2009, the court declared minor a

ward of the court, placed her in the custody of her mother, and granted probation subject to various terms and conditions.

### DISCUSSION

On June 17, 2009, minor filed a notice of appeal. We appointed counsel to represent minor on appeal. Appointed counsel on appeal has filed a brief under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth the facts and procedural history, raising no specific issues, and requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the record. On August 27, 2009, we offered minor an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, which she failed to do. We have now concluded our independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ

P. J.

We concur:

GAUT

J.

KING

J.